



## NEWS RELEASE

For Immediate Release

Media Contact: Joe DiLaura 317-232-3396

Robert Shula 317-234-0263

### State, County and MSA Unemployment Report

## **January Revised and February Preliminary State Unemployment Figures Released**

INDIANAPOLIS (March 31, 2006) – The Indiana Department of Workforce Development today released revised January and preliminary February unemployment figures for the state, all 92 counties and metropolitan statistical areas.

Indiana's preliminary seasonally adjusted unemployment rate for February 2006 was 5.1 percent, down from 5.5 percent in February 2005, and up from 4.7 percent in January 2006. Nationally, the unemployment rate also increased, from 4.7 percent in January 2006 to 4.8 percent in February.

"Compared to this time last year, 89,000 more Hoosiers are employed, as our labor force continues to expand," said Ron Stiver, Commissioner of the Department of Workforce Development.

Stiver noted that the state's labor force is now estimated to be 3,236,800, up 73,000 from last year's 3,163,100. "As I indicated last month, the growing state labor force along with the fact that more people are employed are all signs of a growing economy. Legislation enacted by the 2006 General Assembly such as the Major Moves transportation act should help continue these positive trends in future months."

### **Seasonally Adjusted:**

Indiana's preliminary seasonally adjusted unemployment rate for February was 5.1 percent, four-tenths of a percentage point higher than last month's 4.7 percent. The rate for the U.S. for February 2006 was 4.8 percent, up from 4.7 percent one month earlier.

For the month of February, Indiana's Midwest neighbors reported the following unemployment rates: Kentucky, 6.3 percent; Illinois, 5.0 percent; Ohio, 5.3 percent; Michigan, 6.6 percent.

For the month of February, the state's estimated seasonally adjusted labor force total was 3,273,800. The number of Hoosier workers employed during February was 3,105,500 and the number of unemployed Hoosiers during February was 168,300. January revised data marked Indiana's labor total at 3,260,700 with 3,106,800 employed and 153,900 unemployed.

### **Non-Seasonally Adjusted:**

Using the same data and reporting non-seasonally adjusted employment trends, Indiana's February preliminary non-seasonally adjusted unemployment rate was 5.8 percent, which is down six-tenths of a percentage point from one year ago, when it was 6.4 percent.

The U.S. non-seasonally adjusted unemployment rate was 5.1 percent for the month of February, unchanged from the previous month and down seven-tenths of a percentage point from a year ago. Of Indiana's neighboring states reporting

non-seasonally adjusted unemployment rates, Kentucky's rate was 7.2 percent and Illinois' rate was 5.5 percent. Ohio reported an unemployment rate of 6.1 percent, while Michigan's rate was reported to be 7.2 percent.

The Indiana Department of Workforce Development is charged with continually improving the Hoosier workforce by assisting companies to create new jobs and improve worker skills. The agency offers a variety of training and educational grants, partners with Indiana's 26 WorkOne Centers, administers the unemployment insurance system, provides labor market information, assists employers with preparing workers for layoffs and closures and operates a statewide job placement service.

For more information on Indiana's unemployment rate or the Innovating Indiana Strategic Skills Initiative, contact the department at 1-888-WorkOne, or visit the website at [www.workforce.IN.gov](http://www.workforce.IN.gov).

Technical Notes:

- In calculating unemployment rates, two different types of numbers are provided. The first, known as the *non-seasonally adjusted rate*, estimates employment and unemployment without taking into account the effects of seasonal trends. In calculating the *seasonally adjusted rate*, or employment that follows more or less a regular pattern each year, holiday, summer and other types of seasonal employment is factored out of the estimate. These adjustments make it easier to observe the cyclical and other non-seasonal movements.
- As previously announced BLS had found errors in some of the employment inputs used in the sub state estimates published earlier this year and decided to conduct a thorough review of all inputs. That review is now complete. The corrections to the data for January, February and March 2005 had small to moderate impacts on employment and labor force levels and little impact on unemployment rates in most areas. The labor force, unemployment and unemployment rate data for 2004 presented in this release also reflects the corrections to the inputs.
- Compiled in conjunction with the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, the State's unemployment rate is derived from a national survey of about 60,000 households. Of that number approximately 1,300 Indiana households are polled each month.
- The Household survey that calculates the unemployment rate is conducted by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics and is conducted during the week of the 12<sup>th</sup> of the month.
- Labor force is calculated as the number of people 16 years of age and older who were able and available to work.
- For most accurate analysis, please use revised data sets and not preliminary estimates.

## INDIANA VS. U.S. UNEMPLOYMENT RATES

### Seasonally Adjusted

<b>Indiana</b>	<i>February, 2006</i>	<i>January, 2006</i>	<i>December, 2005</i>	<i>February, 2005</i>
Labor Force	3,273,800	3,260,700	3,228,500	3,199,100
Employed	3,105,500	3,106,800	3,052,500	3,021,600
Unemployed	168,300	153,900	176,000	177,500
Rate	5.1	4.7	5.5	5.5

### **U.S.**

Rate	4.8	4.7	4.9	5.4
------	-----	-----	-----	-----

### Non-Seasonally Adjusted

<b>Indiana</b>	<i>February, 2006</i>	<i>January, 2006</i>	<i>February, 2005</i>
Labor Force	3,236,800	3,224,200	3,163,100
Employed	3,048,600	3,054,000	2,959,400
Unemployed	188,200	170,500	203,700
Rate	5.8	5.3	6.4

### **U.S.**

Rate	5.1	5.1	5.8
------	-----	-----	-----

# LABOR FORCE ESTIMATES

CPS BENCHMARK: 2005

§ § §

EMPLOYMENT BENCHMARK: 2005

THESE ESTIMATES ARE PREPARED IN COOPERATION WITH THE U. S. BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS (BLS) AND HAVE BEEN ADJUSTED TO THE CURRENT POPULATION SURVEY (CPS) FOR USE IN ALLOCATING FEDERAL FUNDS. BECAUSE OF IRREGULAR FLUCTUATIONS IN MONTH TO MONTH CHANGES, THE READER SHOULD USE CAUTION WHEN VIEWING THESE ESTIMATES AS INDICATORS OF ECONOMIC CHANGE.

<u>AREA</u>	<u>LABOR FORCE</u>	<u>EMPLOYED</u>	<u>UNEMPLOYED</u>	<u>RATE</u>	Seasonally Adjusted <u>RATE</u>
<b>U.S.</b>					
February 2006	149,686,000	141,994,000	7,692,000	5.1	4.8
January 2006	149,090,000	141,481,000	7,608,000	5.1	4.7
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	147,649,000	139,100,000	8,549,000	5.8	5.4
<b>INDIANA</b>					
February 2006	3,236,800	3,048,600	188,200	5.8	5.1
January 2006	3,224,500	3,054,000	170,500	5.3	4.7
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	3,163,100	2,959,400	203,700	6.4	5.5
<b><u>METROPOLITAN STATISTICAL AREAS</u></b>					
<b>ANDERSON MSA</b>					
February 2006	64,570	59,900	4,670	7.2	
January 2006	63,990	59,700	4,290	6.7	
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	62,780	58,060	4,720	7.5	
<b>BLOOMINGTON MSA</b>					
February 2006	97,180	91,890	5,290	5.4	
January 2006	96,320	91,440	4,880	5.1	
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	95,400	89,750	5,650	5.9	
<b>COLUMBUS MSA</b>					
February 2006	37,790	35,790	2,000	5.3	
January 2006	37,450	35,630	1,820	4.9	
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	36,730	34,660	2,070	5.6	
<b>ELKHART-GOSHEN MSA</b>					
February 2006	102,600	97,590	5,010	4.9	
January 2006	102,600	98,060	4,540	4.4	
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	99,570	94,500	5,070	5.1	
<b>EVANSVILLE MSA</b>					
February 2006	183,770	173,880	9,890	5.4	
January 2006	183,340	174,250	9,090	5.0	
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	180,670	170,130	10,540	5.8	
<b>FORT WAYNE MSA</b>					
February 2006	214,480	201,210	13,270	6.2	
January 2006	214,940	204,160	10,780	5.0	
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	207,600	194,480	13,120	6.3	
<b>GARY</b>					
February 2006	333,430	312,860	20,570	6.2	
January 2006	329,870	311,670	18,200	5.5	
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	324,560	301,970	22,590	7.0	
<b>INDIANAPOLIS-CARMEL MSA</b>					
February 2006	880,390	836,000	44,390	5.0	
January 2006	880,800	839,770	41,030	4.7	
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	860,520	811,280	49,240	5.7	
<b>KOKOMO MSA</b>					
February 2006	47,140	43,590	3,550	7.5	
January 2006	47,120	43,820	3,300	7.0	
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	47,450	43,860	3,590	7.6	
<b>LAFAYETTE MSA</b>					
February 2006	97,010	92,200	4,810	5.0	
January 2006	95,890	91,520	4,370	4.6	
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	93,990	88,760	5,230	5.6	
<b>MICHIGAN CITY-LAPORTE MSA</b>					
February 2006	54,420	50,630	3,790	7.0	
January 2006	53,900	50,520	3,380	6.3	
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	52,450	48,470	3,980	7.6	

<u>AREA</u>	<u>LABOR FORCE</u>	<u>EMPLOYED</u>	<u>UNEMPLOYED</u>	<u>RATE</u>
<b>MUNCIE MSA</b>				
February 2006	56,570	52,520	4,050	7.2
January 2006	56,000	52,350	3,650	6.5
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	56,200	51,540	4,660	8.3
<b>SOUTH BEND-MISHAWAKA MSA</b>				
February 2006	166,230	156,800	9,430	5.7
January 2006	164,930	156,380	8,550	5.2
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	160,570	151,070	9,500	5.9
<b>TERRE HAUTE MSA</b>				
February 2006	82,290	76,420	5,870	7.1
January 2006	81,020	75,520	5,500	6.8
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	80,580	73,760	6,820	8.5
<b><u>COUNTIES</u></b>				
<b>ADAMS</b>				
February 2006	16,690	15,800	890	5.3
January 2006	17,020	16,250	770	4.5
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	16,440	15,380	1,060	6.4
<b>ALLEN (FORT WAYNE MSA)</b>				
February 2006	181,500	170,240	11,260	6.2
January 2006	181,920	172,740	9,180	5.0
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	175,640	164,540	11,100	6.3
<b>BARTHOLOMEW (COLUMBUS MSA)</b>				
February 2006	37,790	35,790	2,000	5.3
January 2006	37,450	35,630	1,820	4.9
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	36,730	34,660	2,070	5.6
<b>BENTON (LAFAYETTE MSA)</b>				
February 2006	4,860	4,565	295	6.1
January 2006	4,805	4,535	270	5.6
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	4,690	4,395	295	6.3
<b>BLACKFORD</b>				
February 2006	6,970	6,430	540	7.7
January 2006	6,890	6,405	485	7.1
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	6,850	6,250	600	8.7
<b>BOONE (INDIANAPOLIS MSA)</b>				
February 2006	27,010	25,790	1,220	4.5
January 2006	27,040	25,910	1,130	4.2
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	26,360	25,030	1,330	5.0
<b>BROWN (INDIANAPOLIS MSA)</b>				
February 2006	8,265	7,685	580	7.0
January 2006	8,290	7,720	570	6.9
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	8,115	7,460	655	8.1
<b>CARROLL (LAFAYETTE MSA)</b>				
February 2006	10,920	10,280	640	5.9
January 2006	10,780	10,210	570	5.3
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	10,570	9,900	670	6.3
<b>CASS</b>				
February 2006	19,370	18,110	1,260	6.5
January 2006	19,250	18,130	1,120	5.8
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	19,240	17,880	1,360	7.1
<b>CLARK (LOUISVILLE MSA)</b>				
February 2006	53,600	50,600	3,000	5.6
January 2006	53,550	50,940	2,610	4.9
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	52,230	49,080	3,150	6.0
<b>CLAY (TERRE HAUTE MSA)</b>				
February 2006	13,430	12,590	840	6.2
January 2006	13,260	12,440	820	6.2
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	13,220	12,150	1,070	8.1
<b>CLINTON</b>				
February 2006	17,180	16,130	1,050	6.1
January 2006	17,050	16,040	1,010	5.9
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	16,880	15,690	1,190	7.1

<u>AREA</u>	<u>LABOR FORCE</u>	<u>EMPLOYED</u>	<u>UNEMPLOYED</u>	<u>RATE</u>
<b>CRAWFORD</b>				
February 2006	5,615	5,075	540	9.6
January 2006	5,520	5,020	500	9.1
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	5,495	4,940	555	10.1
<b>DAVISS</b>				
February 2006	14,990	14,320	670	4.5
January 2006	14,940	14,330	610	4.1
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	14,670	13,960	710	4.8
<b>DEARBORN (CINCINNATI MSA)</b>				
February 2006	26,590	25,040	1,550	5.8
January 2006	26,440	25,040	1,400	5.3
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	25,830	24,120	1,710	6.6
<b>DECATUR</b>				
February 2006	12,740	12,050	690	5.4
January 2006	12,650	12,020	630	5.0
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	12,530	11,730	800	6.4
<b>DEKALB</b>				
February 2006	22,220	20,680	1,540	6.9
January 2006	22,280	20,820	1,460	6.5
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	21,730	20,210	1,520	7.0
<b>DELAWARE (MUNCIE MSA)</b>				
February 2006	56,570	52,520	4,050	7.2
January 2006	56,000	52,350	3,650	6.5
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	56,200	51,540	4,660	8.3
<b>DUBOIS</b>				
February 2006	22,330	21,350	980	4.4
January 2006	22,380	21,500	880	3.9
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	21,900	20,930	970	4.4
<b>ELKHART (ELKHART-GOSHEN)</b>				
February 2006	102,600	97,590	5,010	4.9
January 2006	102,600	98,060	4,540	4.4
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	99,570	94,500	5,070	5.1
<b>FAYETTE</b>				
February 2006	11,850	10,880	970	8.2
January 2006	11,840	10,930	910	7.7
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	11,620	10,590	1,030	8.9
<b>FLOYD (LOUISVILLE MSA)</b>				
February 2006	37,710	35,630	2,080	5.5
January 2006	37,720	35,880	1,840	4.9
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	36,900	34,570	2,330	6.3
<b>FOUNTAIN</b>				
February 2006	8,915	8,395	520	5.8
January 2006	8,880	8,405	475	5.3
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	8,725	8,130	595	6.8
<b>FRANKLIN (CINCINNATI MSA)</b>				
February 2006	12,190	11,330	860	7.0
January 2006	12,090	11,340	750	6.2
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	11,910	10,920	990	8.3
<b>FULTON</b>				
February 2006	10,630	9,970	660	6.2
January 2006	10,500	9,900	600	5.7
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	10,380	9,700	680	6.6
<b>GIBSON (EVANSVILLE MSA)</b>				
February 2006	17,360	16,500	860	5.0
January 2006	17,360	16,550	810	4.7
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	17,060	16,100	960	5.6
<b>GRANT</b>				
February 2006	33,940	31,290	2,650	7.8
January 2006	33,680	31,200	2,480	7.4
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	33,850	30,450	3,400	10.1

<u>AREA</u>	<u>LABOR FORCE</u>	<u>EMPLOYED</u>	<u>UNEMPLOYED</u>	<u>RATE</u>
<b>GREENE (BLOOMINGTON MSA)</b>				
February 2006	17,170	15,960	1,210	7.1
January 2006	17,010	15,880	1,130	6.6
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	16,940	15,590	1,350	8.0
<b>HAMILTON (INDIANAPOLIS MSA)</b>				
February 2006	127,410	123,100	4,310	3.4
January 2006	127,470	123,660	3,810	3.0
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	123,970	119,460	4,510	3.6
<b>HANCOCK (INDIANAPOLIS MSA)</b>				
February 2006	33,800	32,220	1,580	4.7
January 2006	33,820	32,360	1,460	4.3
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	32,980	31,260	1,720	5.2
<b>HARRISON (LOUISVILLE MSA)</b>				
February 2006	19,570	18,330	1,240	6.4
January 2006	19,590	18,450	1,140	5.8
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	19,250	17,780	1,470	7.7
<b>HENDRICKS (INDIANAPOLIS MSA)</b>				
February 2006	68,110	65,390	2,720	4.0
January 2006	68,200	65,680	2,520	3.7
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	66,460	63,450	3,010	4.5
<b>HENRY</b>				
February 2006	23,390	21,770	1,620	6.9
January 2006	23,130	21,620	1,510	6.5
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	23,070	21,170	1,900	8.2
<b>HOWARD (KOKOMO MSA)</b>				
February 2006	39,010	35,980	3,030	7.8
January 2006	38,990	36,170	2,820	7.2
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	39,220	36,200	3,020	7.7
<b>HUNTINGTON</b>				
February 2006	21,120	19,660	1,460	6.9
January 2006	20,890	19,800	1,090	5.2
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	20,420	18,990	1,430	7.0
<b>JACKSON</b>				
February 2006	22,120	21,020	1,100	5.0
January 2006	22,110	21,120	990	4.5
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	21,970	20,720	1,250	5.7
<b>JASPER (GARY)</b>				
February 2006	15,550	14,500	1,050	6.7
January 2006	15,360	14,450	910	5.9
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	15,210	14,000	1,210	8.0
<b>JAY</b>				
February 2006	11,710	11,050	660	5.7
January 2006	11,790	11,170	620	5.2
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	11,420	10,610	810	7.1
<b>JEFFERSON</b>				
February 2006	17,540	16,610	930	5.3
January 2006	17,360	16,490	870	5.0
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	17,200	16,150	1,050	6.1
<b>JENNINGS</b>				
February 2006	14,080	13,070	1,010	7.1
January 2006	13,920	12,990	930	6.6
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	13,870	12,720	1,150	8.3
<b>JOHNSON (INDIANAPOLIS MSA)</b>				
February 2006	69,620	66,540	3,080	4.4
January 2006	69,680	66,840	2,840	4.1
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	68,180	64,570	3,610	5.3
<b>KNOX</b>				
February 2006	19,520	18,460	1,060	5.4
January 2006	19,360	18,440	920	4.7
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	19,070	17,990	1,080	5.6

<u>AREA</u>	<u>LABOR FORCE</u>	<u>EMPLOYED</u>	<u>UNEMPLOYED</u>	<u>RATE</u>
<b>KOSCIUSKO</b>				
February 2006	41,760	39,690	2,070	5.0
January 2006	41,730	39,870	1,860	4.4
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	40,300	38,220	2,080	5.2
<b>LAGRANGE</b>				
February 2006	17,310	16,350	960	5.5
January 2006	17,270	16,230	1,040	6.0
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	16,870	15,950	920	5.4
<b>LAKE (GARY )</b>				
February 2006	228,930	214,290	14,640	6.4
January 2006	226,670	213,480	13,190	5.8
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	223,020	206,840	16,180	7.3
<b>LA PORTE (MICHIGAN CITY MSA)</b>				
February 2006	54,420	50,630	3,790	7.0
January 2006	53,900	50,520	3,380	6.3
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	52,450	48,470	3,980	7.6
<b>LAWRENCE</b>				
February 2006	22,510	20,660	1,850	8.2
January 2006	22,470	20,650	1,820	8.1
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	22,480	20,460	2,020	9.0
<b>MADISON (ANDERSON MSA)</b>				
February 2006	64,570	59,900	4,670	7.2
January 2006	63,990	59,700	4,290	6.7
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	62,780	58,060	4,720	7.5
<b>MARION (INDIANAPOLIS MSA)</b>				
February 2006	466,340	440,090	26,250	5.6
January 2006	466,230	442,080	24,150	5.2
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	456,510	427,080	29,430	6.4
<b>MARSHALL</b>				
February 2006	22,910	21,590	1,320	5.8
January 2006	22,850	21,700	1,150	5.0
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	22,370	20,960	1,410	6.3
<b>MARTIN</b>				
February 2006	5,050	4,720	330	6.5
January 2006	5,060	4,750	310	6.1
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	5,140	4,805	335	6.6
<b>MIAMI</b>				
February 2006	17,480	16,290	1,190	6.8
January 2006	17,490	16,390	1,100	6.3
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	17,280	16,020	1,260	7.3
<b>MONROE (BLOOMINGTON MSA)</b>				
February 2006	67,860	64,550	3,310	4.9
January 2006	67,250	64,240	3,010	4.5
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	66,470	63,060	3,410	5.1
<b>MONTGOMERY</b>				
February 2006	19,970	19,010	960	4.8
January 2006	20,070	19,180	890	4.4
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	19,560	18,490	1,070	5.5
<b>MORGAN (INDIANAPOLIS MSA)</b>				
February 2006	37,820	35,650	2,170	5.7
January 2006	37,830	35,810	2,020	5.3
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	36,820	34,600	2,220	6.0
<b>NEWTON (GARY)</b>				
February 2006	7,245	6,810	435	6.0
January 2006	7,190	6,780	410	5.7
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	7,015	6,570	445	6.3
<b>NOBLE</b>				
February 2006	23,820	22,160	1,660	7.0
January 2006	23,780	22,150	1,630	6.9
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	23,450	21,850	1,600	6.8



<u>AREA</u>	<u>LABOR FORCE</u>	<u>EMPLOYED</u>	<u>UNEMPLOYED</u>	<u>RATE</u>
<b>OHIO (CINCINNATI MSA)</b>				
February 2006	3,210	3,020	190	6.0
January 2006	3,200	3,020	180	5.7
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	3,105	2,905	200	6.4
<b>ORANGE</b>				
February 2006	9,675	8,810	865	8.9
January 2006	9,500	8,825	675	7.1
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	9,435	8,540	895	9.5
<b>OWEN (BLOOMINGTON MSA)</b>				
February 2006	12,150	11,380	770	6.4
January 2006	12,070	11,330	740	6.2
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	12,000	11,120	880	7.4
<b>PARKE</b>				
February 2006	8,035	7,480	555	6.9
January 2006	7,990	7,470	520	6.5
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	7,965	7,280	685	8.6
<b>PERRY</b>				
February 2006	9,830	9,195	635	6.4
January 2006	9,780	9,220	560	5.7
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	9,505	8,875	630	6.6
<b>PIKE</b>				
February 2006	6,265	5,935	330	5.3
January 2006	6,265	5,975	290	4.6
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	6,235	5,815	420	6.7
<b>PORTER (GARY)</b>				
February 2006	81,710	77,260	4,450	5.5
January 2006	80,650	76,960	3,690	4.6
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	79,320	74,570	4,750	6.0
<b>POSEY (EVANSVILLE MSA)</b>				
February 2006	14,050	13,350	700	4.9
January 2006	14,050	13,400	650	4.6
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	13,770	13,020	750	5.4
<b>PULASKI</b>				
February 2006	7,005	6,610	395	5.7
January 2006	6,960	6,600	360	5.2
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	6,910	6,460	450	6.5
<b>PUTNAM (INDIANAPOLIS MSA)</b>				
February 2006	17,870	16,760	1,110	6.2
January 2006	18,140	16,840	1,300	7.2
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	17,560	16,270	1,290	7.3
<b>RANDOLPH</b>				
February 2006	13,270	12,130	1,140	8.6
January 2006	13,110	12,100	1,010	7.7
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	13,140	11,890	1,250	9.5
<b>RIPLEY</b>				
February 2006	14,920	14,100	820	5.5
January 2006	14,850	14,070	780	5.2
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	14,700	13,700	1,000	6.8
<b>RUSH</b>				
February 2006	9,635	9,095	540	5.6
January 2006	9,615	9,110	505	5.3
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	9,390	8,865	525	5.6
<b>SAINT JOSEPH (SOUTH BEND MSA)</b>				
February 2006	137,530	129,730	7,800	5.7
January 2006	136,550	129,390	7,160	5.2
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	132,920	124,930	7,990	6.0
<b>SCOTT</b>				
February 2006	11,530	10,710	820	7.1
January 2006	11,530	10,800	730	6.3
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	11,310	10,430	880	7.8

<u>AREA</u>	<u>LABOR FORCE</u>	<u>EMPLOYED</u>	<u>UNEMPLOYED</u>	<u>RATE</u>
<b>SHELBY (INDIANAPOLIS MSA)</b>				
February 2006	24,160	22,770	1,390	5.7
January 2006	24,100	22,870	1,230	5.1
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	23,570	22,100	1,470	6.2
<b>SPENCER</b>				
February 2006	10,510	9,840	670	6.4
January 2006	10,540	9,930	610	5.8
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	10,350	9,590	760	7.3
<b>STARKE</b>				
February 2006	10,790	9,910	880	8.1
January 2006	10,640	9,880	760	7.2
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	10,550	9,610	940	8.9
<b>STEUBEN</b>				
February 2006	17,160	15,930	1,230	7.2
January 2006	17,070	15,960	1,110	6.5
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	16,760	15,510	1,250	7.5
<b>SULLIVAN (TERRE HAUTE MSA)</b>				
February 2006	9,470	8,760	710	7.5
January 2006	9,355	8,660	695	7.4
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	9,300	8,460	840	9.0
<b>SWITZERLAND</b>				
February 2006	5,780	5,500	280	4.9
January 2006	5,755	5,475	280	4.9
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	5,650	5,335	315	5.5
<b>TIPPECANOE (LAFAYETTE MSA)</b>				
February 2006	81,230	77,350	3,880	4.8
January 2006	80,300	76,780	3,520	4.4
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	78,730	74,460	4,270	5.4
<b>TIPTON (KOKOMO MSA)</b>				
February 2006	8,135	7,615	520	6.4
January 2006	8,130	7,655	475	5.8
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	8,230	7,660	570	6.9
<b>UNION</b>				
February 2006	3,915	3,650	265	6.8
January 2006	3,875	3,635	240	6.2
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	3,785	3,520	265	7.1
<b>VANDERBURGH (EVANSVILLE MSA)</b>				
February 2006	92,200	87,230	4,970	5.4
January 2006	91,930	87,510	4,420	4.8
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	90,530	85,100	5,430	6.0
<b>VERMILLION (TERRE HAUTE MSA)</b>				
February 2006	8,265	7,605	660	8.0
January 2006	8,095	7,520	575	7.1
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	8,170	7,345	825	10.1
<b>VIGO (TERRE HAUTE MSA)</b>				
February 2006	51,120	47,450	3,670	7.2
January 2006	50,310	46,900	3,410	6.8
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	49,890	45,800	4,090	8.2
<b>WABASH</b>				
February 2006	17,640	16,510	1,130	6.4
January 2006	17,680	16,640	1,040	5.9
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	17,300	16,070	1,230	7.1
<b>WARREN</b>				
February 2006	4,920	4,685	235	4.8
January 2006	4,870	4,665	205	4.2
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	4,770	4,510	260	5.4
<b>WARRICK (EVANSVILLE MSA)</b>				
February 2006	30,340	28,900	1,440	4.7
January 2006	30,310	28,990	1,320	4.3
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	29,830	28,190	1,640	5.5

<u>AREA</u>	<u>LABOR FORCE</u>	<u>EMPLOYED</u>	<u>UNEMPLOYED</u>	<u>RATE</u>
<b>WASHINGTON (LOUISVILLE MSA)</b>				
February 2006	14,330	13,270	1,060	7.4
January 2006	14,350	13,350	1,000	6.9
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	13,960	12,860	1,100	7.8
<b>WAYNE</b>				
February 2006	33,590	31,180	2,410	7.2
January 2006	33,220	30,850	2,370	7.1
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	33,500	30,730	2,770	8.3
<b>WELLS (FORT WAYNE MSA)</b>				
February 2006	15,170	14,230	940	6.2
January 2006	15,140	14,440	700	4.6
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	14,640	13,750	890	6.1
<b>WHITE</b>				
February 2006	12,080	11,260	820	6.8
January 2006	12,040	11,270	770	6.4
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	11,950	11,040	910	7.6
<b>WHITLEY (FORT WAYNE MSA)</b>				
February 2006	17,820	16,760	1,060	6.0
January 2006	17,890	17,000	890	5.0
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	17,310	16,190	1,120	6.5
<b><u>CITIES (Population over 25,000)</u></b>				
<b>ANDERSON CITY</b>				
February 2006	27,990	25,840	2,150	7.7
January 2006	27,740	25,750	1,990	7.2
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	27,240	25,040	2,200	8.1
<b>BLOOMINGTON CITY</b>				
February 2006	37,260	35,540	1,720	4.6
January 2006	36,840	35,370	1,470	4.0
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	36,440	34,710	1,730	4.8
<b>CARMEL CITY</b>				
February 2006	30,330	29,620	710	2.3
January 2006	30,350	29,760	590	2.0
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	29,510	28,750	760	2.6
<b>COLUMBUS CITY</b>				
February 2006	19,660	18,640	1,020	5.2
January 2006	19,510	18,550	960	4.9
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	19,150	18,050	1,100	5.7
<b>EAST CHICAGO CITY</b>				
February 2006	10,840	9,900	940	8.7
January 2006	10,580	9,860	720	6.8
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	10,710	9,550	1,160	10.8
<b>ELKHART CITY</b>				
February 2006	26,500	24,850	1,650	6.2
January 2006	26,430	24,980	1,450	5.5
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	25,810	24,070	1,740	6.7
<b>EVANSVILLE CITY</b>				
February 2006	60,620	56,950	3,670	6.0
January 2006	60,380	57,130	3,250	5.4
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	59,720	55,550	4,170	7.0
<b>FISHERS TOWN</b>				
February 2006	32,790	31,930	860	2.6
January 2006	32,820	32,070	750	2.3
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	31,850	30,980	870	2.7
<b>FORT WAYNE CITY</b>				
February 2006	113,320	106,160	7,160	6.3
January 2006	113,720	107,720	6,000	5.3
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	110,010	102,610	7,400	6.7
<b>GARY CITY</b>				
February 2006	37,140	34,260	2,880	7.7
January 2006	36,570	34,130	2,440	6.7
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	36,320	33,070	3,250	9.0

<u>AREA</u>	<u>LABOR FORCE</u>	<u>EMPLOYED</u>	<u>UNEMPLOYED</u>	<u>RATE</u>
<b>GOSHEN CITY</b>				
February 2006	15,930	15,190	740	4.6
January 2006	15,950	15,270	680	4.3
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	15,510	14,710	800	5.1
<b>GREENWOOD CITY</b>				
February 2006	23,280	22,240	1,040	4.5
January 2006	23,280	22,340	940	4.1
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	22,810	21,580	1,230	5.4
<b>HAMMOND CITY</b>				
February 2006	35,490	32,830	2,660	7.5
January 2006	34,430	32,700	1,730	5.0
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	34,730	31,690	3,040	8.8
<b>HOBART CITY</b>				
February 2006	14,040	13,130	910	6.5
January 2006	13,760	13,080	680	4.9
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	13,680	12,680	1,000	7.3
<b>INDIANAPOLIS CITY (CONS)</b>				
February 2006	427,820	403,800	24,020	5.6
January 2006	427,370	405,620	21,750	5.1
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	419,000	391,850	27,150	6.5
<b>INDIANAPOLIS CITY (CORE)</b>				
February 2006	422,580	399,010	23,570	5.6
January 2006	422,190	400,820	21,370	5.1
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	414,050	387,220	26,830	6.5
<b>JEFFERSONVILLE CITY</b>				
February 2006	15,060	14,250	810	5.4
January 2006	15,040	14,340	700	4.6
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	14,700	13,830	870	5.9
<b>KOKOMO CITY</b>				
February 2006	21,250	19,280	1,970	9.3
January 2006	21,200	19,390	1,810	8.5
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	21,380	19,400	1,980	9.3
<b>LAFAYETTE CITY</b>				
February 2006	33,640	31,850	1,790	5.3
January 2006	33,300	31,620	1,680	5.0
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	32,740	30,660	2,080	6.3
<b>LAWRENCE TOWN</b>				
February 2006	23,010	21,890	1,120	4.9
January 2006	23,030	21,990	1,040	4.5
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	22,450	21,240	1,210	5.4
<b>MARION CITY</b>				
February 2006	13,440	12,240	1,200	8.9
January 2006	13,310	12,210	1,100	8.3
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	13,440	11,910	1,530	11.4
<b>MERRILLVILLE TOWN</b>				
February 2006	16,380	15,410	970	5.9
January 2006	16,100	15,360	740	4.6
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	15,900	14,870	1,030	6.5
<b>MICHIGAN CITY CITY</b>				
February 2006	15,010	13,850	1,160	7.7
January 2006	14,860	13,820	1,040	7.0
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	14,500	13,260	1,240	8.5
<b>MISHAWAKA CITY</b>				
February 2006	26,920	25,480	1,440	5.3
January 2006	26,740	25,410	1,330	5.0
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	25,990	24,540	1,450	5.6
<b>MUNCIE CITY</b>				
February 2006	31,280	28,940	2,340	7.5
January 2006	30,940	28,840	2,100	6.8
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	31,120	28,400	2,720	8.7
<b>NEW ALBANY CITY</b>				
February 2006	18,610	17,400	1,210	6.5
January 2006	18,590	17,520	1,070	5.8
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	18,200	16,880	1,320	7.2

<u>AREA</u>	<u>LABOR FORCE</u>	<u>EMPLOYED</u>	<u>UNEMPLOYED</u>	<u>RATE</u>
<b>NOBLESVILLE CITY</b>				
February 2006	19,620	18,680	940	4.8
January 2006	19,580	18,760	820	4.2
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	19,120	18,130	990	5.2
<b>PORTAGE CITY</b>				
February 2006	17,920	16,800	1,120	6.3
January 2006	17,520	16,730	790	4.5
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	17,380	16,220	1,160	6.7
<b>RICHMOND CITY</b>				
February 2006	17,370	16,120	1,250	7.2
January 2006	17,160	15,950	1,210	7.1
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	17,360	15,890	1,470	8.5
<b>SCHERERVILLE TOWN</b>				
February 2006	15,440	14,760	680	4.4
January 2006	15,150	14,700	450	3.0
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	15,010	14,240	770	5.1
<b>SOUTH BEND CITY</b>				
February 2006	49,920	46,650	3,270	6.5
January 2006	49,510	46,540	2,970	6.0
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	48,310	44,930	3,380	7.0
<b>TERRE HAUTE CITY</b>				
February 2006	26,980	24,860	2,120	7.8
January 2006	26,500	24,570	1,930	7.3
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	26,330	24,000	2,330	8.9
<b>VALPARAISO CITY</b>				
February 2006	15,180	14,410	770	5.1
January 2006	14,960	14,360	600	4.0
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	14,800	13,910	890	6.0
<b>WEST LAFAYETTE CITY</b>				
February 2006	14,360	13,780	580	4.0
January 2006	14,160	13,680	480	3.4
February 2005 (Benchmarked)	13,860	13,270	590	4.3

NOTES: 1) UNEMPLOYMENT RATES ARE COMPUTED FROM UNROUNDED DATA.  
2) COUNTY DATA MAY NOT ADD TO TOTALS DUE TO ROUNDING.  
3) ESTIMATES FOR THE LATEST YEAR ARE SUBJECT TO REVISION EARLY THE FOLLOWING CALENDAR YEAR.

\*Starting with January 2005 data, new MSA definitions are used. These will be revised back to 2000

\*Also starting with January 2005, new methodology is being used. It will be used back to 2000

INDIANA DEPARTMENT OF WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT  
STRATEGIC RESEARCH & DEVELOPMENT/RESEARCH & ANALYSIS  
LOCAL AREA UNEMPLOYMENT STATISTICS (LAUS)  
10 NORTH SENATE AVENUE PH: (317) 232-1748  
INDIANAPOLIS, INDIANA 46204

To make changes to mailing list information  
(add/drop/change contact)  
Phone: 1-800-262-6949 or  
email: cparker@dwd.in.gov



# RANKING OF COUNTY DATA

FOR FEBRUARY 2006 (PRELIMINARY)

PREPARED MARCH 24, 2006

RANK	AREA	RATE	RANK	AREA	RATE
1	CRAWFORD	9.6	47	BENTON	6.1
2	ORANGE	8.9	48	CLINTON	6.1
3	RANDOLPH	8.6	49	NEWTON	6.0
4	FAYETTE	8.2	50	OHIO	6.0
5	LAWRENCE	8.2	51	WHITLEY	6.0
6	STARKE	8.1	52	CARROLL	5.9
7	VERMILLION	8.0	53	DEARBORN	5.8
8	GRANT	7.8	54	FOUNTAIN	5.8
9	HOWARD	7.8	55	MARSHALL	5.8
10	BLACKFORD	7.7	56	JAY	5.7
11	SULLIVAN	7.5	57	MORGAN	5.7
12	WASHINGTON	7.4	58	PULASKI	5.7
13	DELAWARE	7.2	59	SAINT JOSEPH	5.7
14	MADISON	7.2	60	SHELBY	5.7
15	STEUBEN	7.2	61	CLARK	5.6
16	VIGO	7.2	62	MARION	5.6
17	WAYNE	7.2	63	RUSH	5.6
18	GREENE	7.1	64	FLOYD	5.5
19	JENNINGS	7.1	65	LAGRANGE	5.5
20	SCOTT	7.1	66	PORTER	5.5
21	BROWN	7.0	67	RIPLEY	5.5
22	FRANKLIN	7.0	68	DECATUR	5.4
23	LAPORTE	7.0	69	KNOX	5.4
24	NOBLE	7.0	70	VANDERBURGH	5.4
25	DEKALB	6.9	71	ADAMS	5.3
26	HENRY	6.9	72	BARTHOLOMEW	5.3
27	HUNTINGTON	6.9	73	JEFFERSON	5.3
28	PARKE	6.9	74	PIKE	5.3
29	MIAMI	6.8	75	GIBSON	5.0
30	UNION	6.8	76	JACKSON	5.0
31	WHITE	6.8	77	KOSCIUSKO	5.0
32	JASPER	6.7	78	ELKHART	4.9
33	CASS	6.5	79	MONROE	4.9
34	MARTIN	6.5	80	POSEY	4.9
35	HARRISON	6.4	81	SWITZERLAND	4.9
36	LAKE	6.4	82	MONTGOMERY	4.8
37	OWEN	6.4	83	TIPPECANOE	4.8
38	PERRY	6.4	84	WARREN	4.8
39	SPENCER	6.4	85	HANCOCK	4.7
40	TIPTON	6.4	86	WARRICK	4.7
41	WABASH	6.4	87	BOONE	4.5
42	ALLEN	6.2	88	DAVISS	4.5
43	CLAY	6.2	89	DUBOIS	4.4
44	FULTON	6.2	90	JOHNSON	4.4
45	PUTNAM	6.2	91	HENDRICKS	4.0
46	WELLS	6.2	92	HAMILTON	3.4

INDIANA 5.8



INDIANA  
WORKFORCE  
DEVELOPMENT

# RANKING OF COUNTY DATA

FOR JANUARY 2006 (REVISED)

PREPARED MARCH 24, 2006

RANK	AREA	RATE	RANK	AREA	RATE
1	CRAWFORD	9.1	47	PERRY	5.7
2	LAWRENCE	8.1	48	BENTON	5.6
3	FAYETTE	7.7	49	CARROLL	5.3
4	RANDOLPH	7.7	50	DEARBORN	5.3
5	GRANT	7.4	51	FOUNTAIN	5.3
6	SULLIVAN	7.4	52	MORGAN	5.3
7	HOWARD	7.2	53	RUSH	5.3
8	PUTNAM	7.2	54	HUNTINGTON	5.2
9	STARKE	7.2	55	JAY	5.2
10	BLACKFORD	7.1	56	MARION	5.2
11	ORANGE	7.1	57	PULASKI	5.2
12	VERMILLION	7.1	58	RIPLEY	5.2
13	WAYNE	7.1	59	SAINT JOSEPH	5.2
14	BROWN	6.9	60	SHELBY	5.1
15	NOBLE	6.9	61	ALLEN	5.0
16	WASHINGTON	6.9	62	DECATUR	5.0
17	VIGO	6.8	63	JEFFERSON	5.0
18	MADISON	6.7	64	MARSHALL	5.0
19	GREENE	6.6	65	WHITLEY	5.0
20	JENNINGS	6.6	66	BARTHOLOMEW	4.9
21	DEKALB	6.5	67	CLARK	4.9
22	DELAWARE	6.5	68	FLOYD	4.9
23	HENRY	6.5	69	SWITZERLAND	4.9
24	PARKE	6.5	70	VANDERBURGH	4.8
25	STEUBEN	6.5	71	GIBSON	4.7
26	WHITE	6.4	72	KNOX	4.7
27	LAPORTE	6.3	73	PIKE	4.6
28	MIAMI	6.3	74	PORTER	4.6
29	SCOTT	6.3	75	POSEY	4.6
30	CLAY	6.2	76	WELLS	4.6
31	FRANKLIN	6.2	77	ADAMS	4.5
32	OWEN	6.2	78	JACKSON	4.5
33	UNION	6.2	79	MONROE	4.5
34	MARTIN	6.1	80	ELKHART	4.4
35	LAGRANGE	6.0	81	KOSCIUSKO	4.4
36	CLINTON	5.9	82	MONTGOMERY	4.4
37	JASPER	5.9	83	TIPPECANOE	4.4
38	WABASH	5.9	84	HANCOCK	4.3
39	CASS	5.8	85	WARRICK	4.3
40	HARRISON	5.8	86	BOONE	4.2
41	LAKE	5.8	87	WARREN	4.2
42	SPENCER	5.8	88	DAVISS	4.1
43	TIPTON	5.8	89	JOHNSON	4.1
44	FULTON	5.7	90	DUBOIS	3.9
45	NEWTON	5.7	91	HENDRICKS	3.7
46	OHIO	5.7	92	HAMILTON	3.0

INDIANA 5.3



# Unemployment Rate

February 2006

